

BIRKBECK COLLEGE CRYSTALLOGRAPHY LAB.,
(University of London),
21 Torrington Square,
LONDON, W.C.1.

Dr. Barry Commoner,
Henry Shaw School of Botany,
Washington University,
Saint Louis,
Missouri, U.S.A.

27th April, 1955.

Dear Dr. Commoner,

Thank you for your letter. The paper has been accepted by "Nature", and will appear immediately following that of Rich and Dunitz.

I should very much like to look at I8. I imagine it might be expected to resemble TMV rather closely in structure, so that I should like, at the same time, to look at some of the TMV with which it is associated. Different strains of TMV show appreciable differences in the X-ray diagram, which might well be of the same order of magnitude as the difference between one strain and its associated I8. Do you do all your work on a single strain? Dr. Siegel, at Los Angeles, has sent me some of his U1 and U2 strains, which differ appreciably, the former being rather like the strain I originally had from Pirie. Might a difference of strain account for any of the difference between your preparation and Neumark's?

I have just received some "Protein A" from Schramm. I have not yet obtained any X-ray photographs, but the optical properties confirm the positive contribution of the RNA. It is, in solution, positive and much more highly birefringent than B8, and when dry is weakly negative. The birefringence in the gel state, of the second batch of B8 which you sent, was especially low. The two gel specimens which I preserved from it, in fine capillaries, now both show regions of positive, regions of negative and regions of zero birefringence, all mixed up with one another. The orientation is quite definite, though not good.

I should very much like to have a written summary of your thoughts on these questions, as you suggest.

P.T.O.

I will order the 100 reprints for you.

Yours sincerely,

Rosalind Franklin.